

Date: Mon, 11 Jan 93 21:04:48 PST  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #49  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Mon, 11 Jan 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    49

Today's Topics:

(none)  
Distinct Checks  
Dual Band Mobile Radio  
DXCC Status of Czech and Slovakia?  
FCC Amateur Licensing and \$\$\$  
FT2400 Mods  
HELP ON ALINCO EP-2510 POWER SUPPLY  
IC-22U Modifications  
ICOM-725 Info. (was ICOM-726)  
License Delays (2 msgs)  
Looking for 2m Repeater near Los Angeles Airport  
Nashville 2-meter frequencies  
newsletters  
Question: PACTOR ??  
Question about BC-200xlt scanner  
rcving keps  
Ringo Ranger II performance  
Suggested ARRL 70 cm band plan...

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: 11 Jan 93 20:42:30 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: (none)  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

-----  
Date: Mon, 11 Jan 1993 20:51:34 GMT  
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!mcdchg!mcdphx!  
schuch@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Distinct Checks  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jan5.162348.14051@e2big.mko.dec.com> coolidge@zko.dec.com (Bayard R. Coolidge) writes:

>  
>>> Has anyone ever wondered what it would take to get a company like  
>>> Checks in the Mail (in Calif) to come up with a series of picture  
>>> checks for the ham radio hobby?  
>  
>There are a lot of "third party" check printers (i.e., who do it free-lance  
>as a result of a direct order from you, not through a bank), so shopping  
>(and lobbying) around seems to be warranted. Amway has an agreement with  
>some place, so you can order checks through them. (Basically, you order from

I rember seeing an advertisement for a company who would print checks  
with the background art provided by the end user. Their examples were  
things like your kid's crayon art, or the family portrait. that could  
prove interesting.

I'll have to look around

John

--  
+-----+  
| John R. Schuch - Motorola Computer Group - Manufacturing Engineering |  
| N7XVS - schuch@phx.mcd.mot.com - (602) 438-3008 - CompuServe: 70733.3330 |  
+-----+

-----  
Date: 11 Jan 93 16:36:25 EST  
From: titan.ksc.nasa.gov!k4dii.ksc.nasa.gov!user@ames.arpa  
Subject: Dual Band Moble Radio  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <stellabo.726514916@phage.cshl.org>, stellabo@phage.cshl.org  
(Fred Stellabotte) wrote:  
> Is there a dual band moble rig that does both 10 meters and

> 2 meters .. or 10 meters and 440 ..??

Fred-

There is a Kenwood TM-741A, that comes with 144 MHz and 440 MHz, with a place to plug in an optional third band. Modules are available for the 28 MHz, 50 MHz, 220 MHz and 1200 MHz FM bands.

This info is from the Amateur Electronic Supply catalog. Their price is \$699.95 for the basic radio, and \$269.95 for the 28, 50 and 220 MHz units, or \$359.95 for the 1200 MHz unit.

The AES/Milwaukee phone number is 1-800-558-0411, if you're interested.

73, Fred, K4DII

[fred-mckenzie@ksc.nasa.gov](mailto:fred-mckenzie@ksc.nasa.gov)

-----  
Date: Mon, 11 Jan 1993 21:35:00 GMT  
From: [noc.near.net!lynx!lkay@uunet.uu.net](mailto:noc.near.net!lynx!lkay@uunet.uu.net)  
Subject: DXCC Status of Czech and Slovakia?  
To: [info-hams@ucsd.edu](mailto:info-hams@ucsd.edu)

In article <1682@ncrc1m.ClemsonSC.NCR.COM>,  
[tskelton@ncrc1m.ClemsonSC.NCR.COM](mailto:tskelton@ncrc1m.ClemsonSC.NCR.COM) (Tom Skelton) writes:

> It was reported in the news that as of 1 January 1993, Czechoslovakia  
> had agreed to split into two countries: Czech and Slovakia. Does  
> .....  
> It seems clear, from a DXCC standpoint, we will have 1 deletion and  
> 2 new countries. I hope the DXAC and ARRL Awards Committee act soon...  
> Thanks in advance for any updates. 73, Tom WB4IUX  
>

My \$0.02....

I'm not sure if the DXAC has voted yet, but I heard a local packet rumour (which apparantly has some validity) that according to the ARRL, there seems to be grounds that there might be just 1 new country added. Apparently one of the two (don't know which) has decided to retain Czechoslovakia's flag as their own, and thus this can be argued as a 'continuation' of the old country, so no deletes. Seems pretty foggy to me, but I'm just passing it along....

Len

```
-----
Dr. Leonard Kay, KB2R          | "But we are not dealing with the
Electrical and Computer Engineering | normal world. We are chasing DX."
Northeastern University, Boston  | -- W9KNI, 'The Complete DXer'
NU ARC: W1KBN 145.31(-)         |
Packet: KB2R@K1EA              | #include <disclaimer.h>
-----
```

```
-----
Date: Mon, 11 Jan 1993 20:15:18 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!darwin.sura.net!haven.umd.edu!wam.umd.edu!
ham@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: FCC Amateur Licensing and $$$
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu
```

What we have here is ... "Ability to communicate."

The FCC doesn't get any money from amateur licensing because hams are a "National Resource." Every time someone on Capitol Hill gets the idea of charging hams for having a license and applying for changes in callsign, someone remembers that there was, well, an earthquake or a tornado or a hurricane or other natural disaster that caused a communications breakdown. And who was there to get vital information in and out of the affected area?

Hams. As a general body, hams are well prepared for emergencies, and generally OWN and OPERATE equipment perfectly suited to operate in emergencies. Other branches of the government maintain their equipment as emergency gear, while we keep it in good working condition. We have the best communications system out there, and it's always in good shape. When the Feds go to respond to an emergency, they have to scramble to get everything ready. We just go over to the rig, hook up a car battery or generator, and we're ready to go. And we're stationed all over the country - nearly every town has a ham or two, some even have a few thousand...

So by not charging hams to operate, and with constant reminders that we are a really good source of emergency communications, the FCC and Congress allows us to spend licensing fees on equipment maintenance and the purchase of newer, better equipment. We just have to remember that, when called upon, we should answer.

As for testing fees, the FCC allows the Volunteer Examiner Coordinator (VEC) like W5YI, Laurel-VEC, and ARRL-VEC, to collect up to \$5.60 per examinee to cover operational costs, such as gasoline, donuts, copying, postage, etc., etc. With W5YI, if less than 9 people are tested, \$3.10 per person goes to W5YI, while \$2.50 stays with the examining team for

expenses. For 10 or more people, W5YI gets like \$2.50/person, and the VE's get \$3.10 per person for expenses. These figures are approximate as the numbers have just changed, and I don't have them memorized yet.

P.S. Giving the FCC money would not improve service, just get more money into the FCC pot. The FCC really doesn't do very much with ham radio anymore. All they do is FILE the forms and print up licenses. The rules are already written (not many changes to be made), and the amateur service is now said to be "self-policing." We can report violations to the FCC, but they won't usually go after anyone on the ham bands on their own behalf. We are trusted to be mature, and for the most part, we are.

So no, for the most part the general public's taxes are not supporting the amateur service, because the FCC hardly puts any time or money into it in the first place. Not that I wouldn't pay \$5 a year, but the FCC really doesn't NEED it.

Happy hamming. Just my \$0.04 worth.

73, Scott NF3I

-----  
Date: 11 Jan 93 19:57:59 GMT  
From: usc!news.bbn.com!olivea!spool.mu.edu!caen!destroyer!cs.ubc.ca!unixg.ubc.ca!  
kakwa.ucs.ualberta.ca!vm.ucs.UAlberta.CA!CJSRFM@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: FT2400 Mods  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hello All:

I just purchased a Yeasu FT-2400 2m transceiver and I was wondering if there were any mods available for it.

Please leave me a message here if you know any.

Thanks in advance!

Ray Semenovff - VE6RHS

-----  
Date: Mon, 11 Jan 1993 23:44:20 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!paladin.american.edu!gatech!destroyer!fmsrl7!  
lynx.unm.edu!nmsu.edu!opus!forozco@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: HELP ON ALINCO EP-2510 POWER SUPPLY  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I need help getting the current "output" of the Alinco EP-2510 Power Supply.

What I basically need to know is if I can use this supply to run a kenwood TS-440S. the 440's current drain is about 20 amps. the power supply is a big thing, and it looks like it is capable of at least those 20 amps, but I would like to know for sure. Right now i am running an Icom IC-790A off it with no problems at all.

Any help would be greatly appreciated.

73's de luis

--

Luis F. Orozco	N	5	U	H	B
forozco@dante.nmsu.edu			g	o	o
forozco@freedom.nmsu.edu			l	m	y
			y	e	

-----  
Date: 11 Jan 93 16:19:23 EST  
From: titan.ksc.nasa.gov!k4dii.ksc.nasa.gov!user@ames.arpa  
Subject: IC-22U Modifications  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <9301111703.AA29979@chesapeake.ads.com>,  
delancy@chesapeake.ads.com (J.D. Delancy) wrote:  
> Does anyone have information of modifying an ICOM IC-22U  
> for operation out of band for MARS (AF) and CAP?

J. D.-

The IC-22U has the 4 MHz bit permanently on, and the 8 MHz bit permanently off. It isn't too hard to remove the jumpers, which are actually "zero ohm" resistors, and to add jumpers to reconnect the switch contacts. If you have the circuit diagram and other literature that came with the radio, you can figure it out.

However, many MARS and CAP repeaters do not use the standard 600 KHz input/output spacing. To accomplish the unusual spacing will require a little more ingenuity! You might look into switching between the thumbwheel switch common leads, and the common leads of banks of diodes that each determine a frequency. When in the diode mode, you would need some active device to switch between two banks of diodes when going between

transmit and receive. This method might be a bit messy. I think you would also need isolation diodes for 12 of 15 the thumbwheel switch leads.

I don't recall how the 600 KHz offset is accomplished, but believe it to be done by selecting different crystals. If so, you could probably change the offset by changing one crystal, as an alternative to the diode bank method mentioned above.

I found the power output to be "unbelievably" constant 15 watts over most of the 10 MHz range of the radio, after enabling the two additional switch contacts. When I tried to "peak" the output, I discovered that there was an automatic carrier level control circuit. If you want to peak yours, you will first have to turn the power control all the way up, repeak, and then set the power back down!

73, Fred, K4DII

[fred-mckenzie@ksc.nasa.gov](mailto:fred-mckenzie@ksc.nasa.gov)

-----  
Date: 9 Jan 93 02:04:04 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!olivea!gossip.pyramid.com!pyramid!  
infmtx!seashore!randall@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: ICOM-725 Info. (was ICOM-726)  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

[gallaghe@gdc.com](mailto:gallaghe@gdc.com) (Robert Gallagher) writes:

>I previously posted a request for info on the ICOM IC-726, after thinking  
>about this for a while I realized that the IC-725 is the same radio with  
>out the 50MHz band therefore, if anyone has any information on the IC-725  
>or knows of any FTP sites for any ICOM related information please e-mail  
>it to me.

I would say that the 725 is a pretty good value for the money. Its main disadvantage in mobile use is that its noise limiter does not work on AM. That's a problem if you want to work AM on 10m or listen to shortwave. However, the way the frequency readout and control is set up, it is nearly ideal for mobile work. I also have the AH-3 automatic tuner. The two together, along with an 8-foot whip for 10m, make a very nice, easy-to-use mobile setup for 10m through 80m.

The rig does not have Passband tuning or a notch filter, so getting rid of QRM is nearly impossible. For mobile work, I don't fool around with those controls anyway. For base station work,

though, it is a problem not to have them. This rig will not cut the mustard if you want to work contests.

If you want a base station, I would spend a little extra money for a 735. The 735 is generally regarded as the best of the low-end rigs. I have both, and I certainly prefer the 735.

73 DE KK6MY

--

```
=====
Randall Rhea                                Informix Software, Inc.
Project Manager, MIS Sales/Marketing Systems  uunet!pyramid!infmx!randall
-----
```

Date: 11 Jan 1993 13:11:24 -0600  
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: License Delays  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

On Mon, 11 Jan 1993 03:03:35 GMT you said:  
>In article <Pine.3.05.9301101152.A27815-9100000@uafhp.uark.edu>,  
>plaws@uafhp.uark.edu (Peter Laws) writes:  
>  
>> Ya know, maybe if we paid more than \$0.56/yr for our licenses...

<stuff deleted>

>I don't know where you got the figure \$0.56/yr., but for 1992, the

I think you go on to answer your own rant...

>implied examination fee of \$5.60 sounds about right for 1993, though.

See? I \*did\* forget about free renewals...

>again). That's a TESTING fee, not a LICENSE fee.

Hence the reference to volunteer EXAMINERS...

>

>Besides, and more important, that DOESN'T generally go to the  
>volunteer examiners. It goes to the \_volunteer examiner

New factoid (for me). Thought the \*team\* got it. Goes to the League, eh?  
Or Fred.



>NOTHING, they're a Federal Government agency, so even if we're not  
>paying them directly, we're paying them, make no mistake about it!

No kidding? I thought they just printed what they needed. 8-)  
So we should get \*every\*thing for free from them? It's not like a ham  
license is a Constitutional Right. Do we really expect all the taxpayers  
to subsidize our hobby?

Peter  
A Damn Codeless Tech  
(who is rapidly desending the slippery slope to libertarianism...)

Peter Laws|GEnie:P.LAWS1|"The '90s are gonna make the '60s|plaws@uafhp.uark.edu  
n5uwy@ka5bml.ar.usa.noam| look like the '50s"--D. Hopper |plaws@uafsysb.bitnet

-----  
Date: 11 Jan 93 13:36:40 EST  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!pacific.mps.ohio-  
state.edu!ohstpy!miavx1!miavx3.mid.muohio.edu!clmorgan@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: License Delays  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <Pine.3.05.9301101152.A27815-91000000@uafhp.uark.edu>,  
plaws@uafhp.uark.edu (Peter Laws) writes:  
> Ya know, maybe if we paid more than \$0.56/yr for our licenses...  
>  
> BUT WAIT!  
> The FCC doesn't even get that!!!!!! That goes to the \_volunteer\_  
> examiners. The \_paid\_ FCC gets NOTHING. Nothing but headaches from WHINY  
> hams.  
>  
> It's a wonder we get any allocations.  
>  
> Here's to a \$50, 10 year ticket...  
>  
> Peter  
>  
> Peter Laws|GEnie:P.LAWS1|"The '90s are gonna make the '60s|plaws@uafhp.uark.edu  
> n5uwy@ka5bml.ar.usa.noam| look like the '50s" --D. Hopper|plaws@uafsysb.bitnet  
>  
>  
Too bad, Peter, that you don't know the facts. The fee collected is a \*TEST  
FEE\*, not a license fee. The full amount, less necessary and prudent expenses,  
is forwarded by the VEs to the VEC. THE TESTING VEs ARE PAID NOTHING and to  
imply otherwise alleges violation of the FCC's rules.

As for the FCC not being paid .... hard to believe they aren't mentioned in the Federal Budget.

73 >< Carl  
K8NHE

-----  
Date: Tue, 12 Jan 1993 02:20:45 GMT  
From: world!rdg@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Looking for 2m Repeater near Los Angeles Airport  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Greetings:

A ham friend and I are scheduled to meet up together this Thursday in Los Angeles at LAX. Since we are coming in at different times and on different airlines, we thought we could use our HT's to find each other.

However, a review of the ARRL repeater directory is not much help to someone from out of the area... so, can someone point me to an open repeater which covers the LAX area? We have scheduled a simplex frequency, but we would like to have a repeater to be on the safe side, especially if one of us has to leave the airport before tracking down the other.

Many thanks in advance and 73... Rich Goldstein (KA2TMT)  
rdg@world.std.com

--  
Richard D. Goldstein  
Schiller & Kusmer  
Patent Attorneys At Law  
(617) 227-5454 Telephone

-----  
Date: 11 Jan 93 13:35:11 CST  
From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!ukma!  
netnews.louisville.edu!wkuvx1!kallits@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Nashville 2-meter frequencies  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I am interested in finding 2-meter repeater and packet frequencies for the Nashville, TN or central TN area. Any help would be greatly appreciated.

Tim Kallio

-----  
Date: Mon, 11 Jan 93 15:42:16 EST  
From: tstader@aol.com  
Subject: newsletters  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Jeff and others....

> Ham club newsletter editors:  
> I publish the monthly newsletter for Orange County Radio  
> Amateurs (OCRA) here in central NC and would like to exchange  
> newsletters with other clubs around the U.S., the idea being to  
> swap ideas and possibly even material. I would be happy to send  
> a copy of our newsletter to anyone who sends me a copy of  
> theirs to the following address.  
>  
> ARS KD4JIA  
> Jeff Anderson  
> 2258 Sandy Lane  
> Mebane, NC 27302  
>  
> Thanks!

Being as most of us have e-mail addresses... if you are interested I'd be glad to send you our "electronic edition" of the PARTicles newsletter. The toughest thing we have is paying for the postage of all of our "freebie" newsletters! I'd much rather send it to you electronically.... lots cheaper. Granted you cannot cut out my graphics and use them... but the text is importable!

What do you say?

<Jeff, would have replied to you directly... but cannot translate your internet address!>

73 for now.... c u on the shortwaves  
Terry Stader - KA8SCP  
America Online Ham Radio Club Host  
Internet: tstader@aol.com (files <28K) or  
tstader@attmail.com ( files >28K)  
KA8SCP@WA1PHY.#EMA.MA.USA.NOAM  
ka8scp@ka8scp.ampr.org [44.56.4.82] Mac  
ka8scp-1@ka8scp-1.ampr.org [44.56.4.120] DOS Clone  
(they're BOTH pc's!)

Date: 11 Jan 93 13:50:34 EST  
From: overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!gatech!paladin.american.edu!  
howland.reston.ans.net!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu!  
ohstpy!miavx1!miavx3.mid.@dog.ee.lbl.gov  
Subject: Question: PACTOR ??  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Anyone out there knowledgeable (I'm afraid to use the word "expert") about  
PACTOR?

Would like to read pros-'n-cons from others.

Thanks.

73 >< Carl  
K8NHE

-----  
Date: Mon, 11 Jan 1993 22:44:01 EST  
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uunet.ca!xenitec!lemsys!  
clemon@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Question about BC-200xlt scanner  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hello all, I'm posting this for a friend who has a bc-200xlt  
hand-held scanner. He apparently doesn't have a manual and is having  
some difficulty with the "test mode" (exiting it, to be exact). It would  
be appreciated if someone with information could relay any knowledge about  
the "test mode" to myself to forward to him. Also, I believe he is  
interested in getting an entire manual for the scanner. I think he already  
has the service manual (implies it) but doesn't have the user's manual (now  
THAT's an interesting situation! :-)) and the service manual documentation  
seems sketchy on the subject. Thanks in advance,

--

Craig Lemon VE3XCL (Advanced) - Kitchener, Ontario. +1 519 741 0297  
clemon@lemsys.UUCP clemon%lemsys@xenitec.on.ca | 1B Electrical Engineering  
TCP/IP: ve3xcl@ve3xcl.ampr.org [44.135.84.51] | University of Waterloo  
AX.25 Packet: ve3xcl@ve3euk.#SWON.ON.CAN.NA | Waterloo, Ontario, CANADA

-----  
Date: 11 Jan 93 22:20:09 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: rcving keps  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Would you please put me on the e-mail list for 2-line orbital elements?  
Also if you can, I would appreciate elements for as many satellites as possible,  
not just the ham sats.

Thanks,  
Kevin(N0LSW)

-----  
Date: 12 Jan 1993 00:02:50 GMT  
From: sun-barr!news2me.EBay.Sun.COM!exodus.Eng.Sun.COM!oversteer!wdh@ames.arpa  
Subject: Ringo Ranger II performance  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

The Ringo Ranger II performed much better than a Jpole for me. I replace  
a Jpole with a RR-II using the same mast and coax. Repeaters that were not  
workable with the Jpole became reliably workable with the RR-II.

The jpole was the American Legion unit which is popular in No Cal and well built.

I am glad I made the switch.

...Dennis Henderson, N6TTW, 146.535

ps: I can't comment on ruggedness in harsh winters. I live in California.  
No problems in 1.5 yrs.

-----  
Date: 12 Jan 93 04:38:00 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Suggested ARRL 70 cm band plan...  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

"0000kay kitty cats. READ MY BEAK!" or something along those lines.

I have been watching the purported actual band plans being represented  
in this forum for the past several editions. The numbers given all seemed  
close but not exactly what I remembered as being correct. My main concern  
came from the lack of mention of the subband from 433-435. I picked up  
my repeater directories for the past 4 years and browsed the 70 cm band  
plan once again. This is what they say:

420.000 - 432.000 two ea. 6 mhz wide TV channels

432.000 - 433.000 various subbands of mixed mode, EME, weak signal, CW,  
and propagation beacons.

433.000 - 435.000    AUXILLIARY / REPEATER links (I assume mostly FM...)  
435.000 - 438.000    Satellite only  
438.000 - 444.000    Another ATV allocation that overlaps the next entry...  
442.000 - 445.000    repeater inputs / outputs  
445.000 - 447.000    shared by AUXILLIARY/CONTROL links, repeaters, AND  
                        SIMPLEX operation.  
447.000 - 450.000    more repeater inputs / outputs

I guess if you are running FM with 2 mhz deviation, then the poster saying  
there is only one simplex channel (at 446.000 mhz) is indeed correct ...

Have a nice day.

-----

Date: 11 Jan 1993 21:57:22 GMT  
From: swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!oak!laborde@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <C0n3vs.3HC@NeoSoft.com>, <1993Jan11.170139.26743@eng.umd.edu>,  
<8403@lib.tmc.edu>

Subject : Re: On private repeaters

In article <8403@lib.tmc.edu> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:  
>  
>Looks like 445-447 does just fine, actually...There's nothing wrong with  
>running simplex on a control link frequency...

But Tad wouldn't like it!

-Greg  
(Sorry, couldn't resist)

-----

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #49  
\*\*\*\*\*